

Scotland's Rural College

## Preliminary survey of lamb losses (black loss) in Highland sheep flocks

Tongue, SC; Pritchard, I; Watson, D; Hosie, BD

*Published in:*  
Veterinary Record

*DOI:*  
[10.1136/vr.104010](https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104010)

First published: 23/11/2016

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Tongue, SC., Pritchard, I., Watson, D., & Hosie, BD. (2016). Preliminary survey of lamb losses (black loss) in Highland sheep flocks. *Veterinary Record*, 180(8). <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.104010>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Title: A preliminary survey of lamb losses (black loss) in Highland sheep flocks  
6

7 Authors: S. C. Tongue<sup>1</sup>, I. Pritchard<sup>2</sup>, D. Watson<sup>3</sup>, B. D. Hosie<sup>2</sup>  
8

9 Author details:  
10

11 <sup>1</sup> Epidemiology Research Unit (Inverness Campus), SRUC, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9  
12 3JG  
13

14 <sup>2</sup> SAC Consulting Veterinary Services, SRUC, Bush Estate, Penicuik, Midlothian, EH26 0QE  
15  
16

17 <sup>3</sup> SAOS Ltd, The Rural Centre, Ingliston, Newbridge, EH28 8 NZ  
18

19 Corresponding author: [sue.tongue@sruc.ac.uk](mailto:sue.tongue@sruc.ac.uk) tel: 01463 246064  
20

21 **Abstract:**  
22

23 High levels of lamb loss have implications for the sustainability of hill sheep enterprises. A  
24 questionnaire survey was used to estimate the viable, healthy, mark to wean lamb loss on 40  
25 Scottish Highland farms in the 2011 to 2012 lambing season. An average loss overall of about  
26 one in twenty (animal level 6.6%; flock level 6.2%) masked the wider range. A more detailed  
27 study of five holdings using electronic identification tags produced higher estimates of about one  
28 in five (animal level 18.6%; flock level 8.4 – 25.8%). Reasons for such heavy losses need  
29 further investigation, as they represent not only an animal health and welfare challenge but may  
30 contribute to environmental and social issues too.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Short communication

The sustainability of British sheep farming is dependent on the sale of lambs to provide income. The percentage of lambs reared is affected by losses at different stages in the sheep year cycle. Contributory factors for neonatal and perinatal lamb mortality in sheep are well researched (Dwyer and others 2016, Nowak & Poindron 2006, Binns and others 2002, Haughey 1991) and major causes of subsequent post-natal losses in lowland and upland flocks are well-known. For some, reduction of losses can be achieved through appropriate management and preventive health strategies. In the hills, the extensive nature of the production system combined with comparative remoteness and inaccessibility makes both quantifying losses and identifying potential causes more challenging. This hampers our ability to determine how such losses can be reduced. In the period 2010 to 2013, annual lamb mortality estimates for Scottish, Less Favoured Area, hill, breeding flocks varied from 7% to 17%. These estimates were derived from purebred Blackface and Cheviot flocks (Anon 2013, Anon 2015; number of flocks was less than 30). Our preliminary investigation aimed to explore the level of losses experienced by a wider population of sheep farmers in the Highlands and Islands areas of Scotland.

There were two components: firstly a questionnaire survey and, secondly, a more detailed study of five holdings. A brief one page questionnaire was sent to sheep-producing clients from six SAC Consulting Farm and Rural Business Services (FRBS) Highland offices, in April 2011. For the 2011 lambing season, it requested: the number of ewes – scanned in lamb, marked (i.e. at return to hill after lambing), at shearing and at weaning; the number of lambs – at scanning, marking, shearing and weaning; the main breed of ewe and ram, and the number of female sheep sent to the ram in autumn 2010, plus any additional comments.

Forty-one flocks responded. Almost half (n=19) either did not scan, or did not provide numbers for ewes and lambs at scanning, therefore total losses could not be estimated. A quarter (n=10) did not provide either lamb, or ewe, or both, numbers at shearing. Three did not provide numbers of ewes at weaning; however, two of these provided numbers of weaned lambs, so lamb losses from marking to weaning were estimated for 40 flocks i.e. the loss of live lambs that were healthy, viable and set to be turned out to the hill. The average mark-to-wean, viable, lamb loss overall on an animal basis was 6.6% (95% confidence interval, exact binomial 6.3 – 7%) i.e. the per cent of (number of all lambs that were marked in the 40 flocks minus the number of all lambs that were weaned in the 40 flocks) divided by the total number of lambs that were marked in the 40 flocks. The average flock level loss was 6.2% (Table 1). Reasons given for losses included: foxes, ravens and hooded crows (*Corvus cornix*), eagles (sea and golden), ticks, open drains, yellowsees (plochteach), possible theft and 'braxy' (*Cl. septicum*).

The five detailed study holdings were not included in the survey. In 2011 and 2012, lambs on these five holdings had electronic identification (EID) tags inserted at two to three weeks of age. The tags were re-read: as the lambs left the holding; entered the replacement breeding flock; were retained on the holding, or were found dead. The difference between the numbers inserted and re-read is an estimate of the 'unaccounted for' or 'black' loss of healthy, viable lambs. On a flock basis, this ranged from 8.4 to 25.8%, with an overall animal level loss across both lambing seasons of 18.6% (Table 2).

1  
2  
3 These quantitative estimates for the average 'black loss' of lambs at flock level, in Scottish  
4 Highlands and Islands flocks in the 2011 and 2012 seasons, vary. On the EID study farms it  
5 was just under one in five whereas, in the survey flocks, it was just over one in twenty. The  
6 higher values for the EID flocks are possibly due to the selection process; those with a known  
7 issue, willing to participate in a more detailed investigation, in the hopes of determining root  
8 causes. When hill sheep are gathered for these specific events; all the flock may not return, or  
9 there may be acquisitions from neighbouring flocks. The technology used on the EID farms and  
10 the semi-prospective nature of the survey should have reduced any tendency to miscount, or  
11 under-estimate, numbers. Anecdotally, survey feedback was considered to be generally good  
12 with some geographical differences. Any potential response bias, due to subject interest, or  
13 existing problems, could not be assessed, although the lower number of responses at offices  
14 with lower flock level losses may reflect this. Ideally studies would be conducted over a number  
15 of years to ensure that the losses observed are not solely down to time-dependent issues, such  
16 as a bad winter. This might have been a contributory factor in the 2012 season; yet there was  
17 no apparent seasonal difference in the EID study (Table 2). Whatever the reasons, the high end  
18 losses are substantial and have the potential to make a hill sheep enterprise economically  
19 unsustainable. A lack of alternatives for income generation increases the risks of land  
20 abandonment and associated environmental and social changes (SAC 2011, SAC 2008).

21  
22 The published average lamb loss estimates for the period are birth to rearing losses (Anon  
23 2013, Anon 2015) and, therefore, should be higher than the estimates obtained in these two  
24 studies. This highlights the difficulty in being able to define a suitable measurement that is  
25 standardised and comparable across flocks and studies, due to the variance in management  
26 systems within sheep sectors. It will be exacerbated if attempts are made to compare losses  
27 between sectors, or countries.

28  
29 True 'black loss' of lambs is a subset of healthy, viable lamb losses in the marking to weaning  
30 period; the ones for which the causal reasons are unknown. In order to reduce black loss,  
31 improve technical efficiency and thus economic sustainability, the causes need to be elucidated.  
32 The survey farmers report potential reasons for losses that mostly focus on observable causes.  
33 In the terrain, conditions and management systems that these sheep live it is difficult to  
34 investigate causes, especially when resources available for investigations are low (e.g. labour).  
35 If the issue of 'black loss' is to be adequately addressed other, possibly novel, methods need to  
36 be found. Exploration of differences between farms at either end of the spectrum of losses is  
37 one avenue for investigation. Another possibility is to use new technologies to detect, find,  
38 recover or view 'lost' lambs in situ. Previously post-mortem investigation has been compromised  
39 by the inability to recover carcasses within a suitable time period and so there is a grey area in  
40 the definition of 'black loss'. In Norway satellite data services are being used to geo-fence  
41 sheep, to track them to determine grazing patterns and to reduce predator attacks (Anon, 2016).  
42 Whether this and/or the use of unmanned aerial vehicles would be suitable for the Scottish  
43 Highlands requires further investigation.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Descriptive results from the forty useable questionnaires

		Number of female sheep that went to the ram per flock	Viable Lamb loss (mark-wean) at flock level* %
FRBS Office	Number of Flocks	Mean Min - Max	Mean Min - Max
Lewis	10	98 28 - 332	5.0 0 - 14.3
Campbelltown	7	723 272 - 1925	5.2 0 - 22.8
Thurso	4	312 175 - 596	1.3 0 - 3.3
Inverness	1	475 n/a	3.7 n/a
Skye	7	575 244 - 842	7.2 0.9 - 10.5
Oban	11	934 87 - 2350	9.2 0 - 41.4
Overall	40	552 28-2350	6.2 0 - 41.4

i.e. the per cent of (the number of lambs in an individual flock that were marked minus the number of lambs in that flock that were weaned) divided by the number of lambs in that flock that were marked

Table 2: Summarised results from the five EID detailed study holdings

	Number of lambs (%)		
	Tagged	Retrieved from dead lambs	Lamb tags unaccounted for*
Overall (animal level) 2011/12	2056	34 (1.7)	400 (19.5)
Overall (animal level) 2012/13	3007	39 (1.3)	541 (18.0)
Overall (animal level) both seasons	5093	73 (1.4)	941 (18.6)
Flock level range for 2011/12; min to max	233 - 600	2 - 10 (0.3 - 1.7)	31 - 135 (10.5 - 22.5)
Flock level mean 2011/12			(19.4)
Flock level range for 2012/13	201 - 1503	3 - 17 (1.5 - 2.6)	29 - 348 (8.4 - 25.8)
Flock level mean 2012/13			(15.6)
Flock level range across both seasons	201 - 1503	2 - 17 (0.3 - 2.6)	29 - 348 (8.4 - 25.8)
Flock level mean across both seasons			(17.4)

\*estimate of black loss

## Acknowledgements

These investigations would not have occurred without the Highlands & Islands Sheep Health Association (HISHA). Funding for the study was provided by HISHA, Quality Meat Scotland, and ScotEID. The questionnaire survey relied on the goodwill of the SAC Consulting FRBS Offices, their staff and their sheep clients. The EID study was run by SOAS Ltd. All their contributions are gratefully acknowledged. Dr Sue C. Tongue was supported by the Scottish Government's RESAS Strategic Research Programme 2011 – 2016 Work Package 6.1 - Measurement and monitoring to enhance livestock health in Scotland.

## References

- DWYER, C. M., CONNINGTON, J., CORBIERE, F., HOLMEY, I.H., MURI, K., NOWAK, R., ROOKE, J., VIPOND, J., & GAUTIER, J. M. (2016) Improving neonatal survival in small ruminants: science into practice. *Animal* **10**, 449-459 doi:10.1017/S1751731115001974
- NOWAK, R. & POINDRON, P. (2006) From birth to colostrum: early steps leading to lamb survival. *Reproduction, Nutrition, Development* **46**, 431-44 doi:10.1051/rnd:2006023
- BINNS, S.H., COX, I.J., RIZVI, S. & GREEN, L.E. (2002) Risk factors for lamb mortality on UK sheep farms. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **52**, 287-303
- HAUGHEY, K.G. (1991) Perinatal lamb mortality – its investigation, causes and control. *Journal of the South African Veterinary Association* **62**, 78-91
- ANON., (2013) Quality Meat Scotland Cattle and Sheep Enterprise profitability in Scotland – 2013 Edition  
<http://www.qmscotland.co.uk/cattle-and-sheep-enterprise-profitability-scotland-2013-edition>  
Accessed 01 March 2016
- ANON., (2015) Quality Meat Scotland Cattle and Sheep Enterprise profitability in Scotland – 2015 Edition  
<http://www.qmscotland.co.uk/cattle-and-sheep-enterprise-profitability-scotland>  
Accessed 01 March 2016
- SAC (2008) Farming's Retreat from the Hills. A SAC Rural Policy Centre report.  
[http://www.sruc.ac.uk/info/120484/support\\_to\\_agriculture\\_archive/54/2008\\_farmings\\_retreat\\_from\\_the\\_hills](http://www.sruc.ac.uk/info/120484/support_to_agriculture_archive/54/2008_farmings_retreat_from_the_hills) Accessed 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016
- SAC (2011) Response from the Hills. A SAC Rural Policy Centre report.  
[http://www.sruc.ac.uk/info/120484/support\\_to\\_agriculture\\_archive/54/2008\\_farmings\\_retreat\\_from\\_the\\_hills](http://www.sruc.ac.uk/info/120484/support_to_agriculture_archive/54/2008_farmings_retreat_from_the_hills) Accessed 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016

ANON., (2016) <http://www.findmysheep.com/en> Accessed 01 March 2016

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60